

independent of cell selection made by other similarly located terminals].

4. (Twice Amended) A cellular radio system terminal [(35)], which is arranged to set up and maintain radio communication with base stations [(31, 32, 33, 34) in [the] cells [(31a, 32a, 33a, 34a)] of the cellular radio system, wherein the terminal is arranged to favor at least one [individual] cell based on data specific to that terminal stored in and received from a network [(32a, 33a) with respect to other cells (31a, 34a), in a manner independent of cell selection made by other similarly located terminals].

6. (Twice Amended) A method to realise cell prioritizing in a cellular radio system [(30)] comprising terminals [(35)], cells [(31a, 32a, 33a, 34a)] and a network including stationary network equipment [(36, 37)], of which said terminals are arranged to set up and maintain radio communication with base stations in the cells, wherein the method utilizes priority data relating to a terminal in order to favor at least one [individual] cell based on data specific to that terminal stored in and received from the network [(32a, 33a) with respect to other cells (31a, 34a), in a manner independent of cell selection made by other similarly located terminals].

REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1 to 10.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC 112 first paragraph. It was the Examiner's position that it was not clear how in

setting up and maintaining radio communication, at least one terminal is arranged to favor at least one cell with respect to other cells.

By amendment herein, the language in claims 1, 4 and 6 that the Examiner objected to, has been removed. Instead these claims now recite that at least one terminal is arranged to favor at least one cell based on data specific to that terminal stored in and received from the network. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at, among other places, starting on page 8, line 30 and continuing to page 9, line 20. In fact, the advantages of Applicant's invention, as set forth in claims 1, 4 and 6 are discussed in detail on page 9, lines 6-20. The examiner is respectfully referred thereto.

Thus, the language in claims 1, 4 and 6 is clear and is supported by the specification.

There is at present no prior art rejection in this application. However, Applicant's invention is distinguishable from the prior art of record for the reasons set forth in the prior amendment. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 are directed to patentable subject matter.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker

NOVEMBER 16, 2000

David Aker (Reg. No. 29,277)

Date

PERMAN & GREEN, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430
(203) 259-1800 x108

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and trademark office on the date shown below.

Type or print name of person signing certification

DAVID AKER

Signature David Aker

Date NOVEMBER 16, 2000